General Benchmarks for Quantum Repeaters

Stefano Pirandola and Riccardo Laurenza
Computer Science and York Centre for Quantum Technologies, University of York, York YO10 5GH, United Kingdom

Using a technique based on quantum teleportation, we simplify the most general adaptive protocols for key distribution, entanglement distillation and quantum communication over a wide class of quantum channels in arbitrary dimension. Thanks to this method, we bound the ultimate rates for secret key generation and quantum communication through single-mode Gaussian channels and several discrete-variable channels. In particular, we derive exact formulas for the two-way assisted capacities of the bosonic quantum-limited amplifier and the dephasing channel in arbitrary dimension, as well as the secret key capacity of the qubit erasure channel. Our results establish the limits of quantum communication with arbitrary systems and set the most general and precise benchmarks for testing quantum repeaters in both discrete- and continuous-variable settings.

arXiv:1512.04945v2 [quant-ph] 5 Jan 2016

Today's quantum technologies are the subject of an increasing interest by the scientific community, and represent one the biggest investments of research funding bodies. The promise of reliable and completely secure quantum communications [1–5] is an appealing alternative to the present classical infrastructure. The idea of developing a quantum Internet [6], which might lead to a world-wide architecture for distributed quantum processing, is attracting huge efforts from different fields, such as quantum optics and condensed matter physics. Hybrid solutions based on different substrates and technologies are considered the best strategies in this direction [7–10].

However, the problem is that quantum information is generally more fragile than its classical counterpart. Exotic quantum features may be rapidly washed away by the inevitable interactions with the external environment. Noise and decoherence may greatly limit the performances of the various quantum protocols, as quantified by their optimal rates for transmitting quantum information, entanglement or secret correlations. This is an underlying limitation which potentially affect any direct quantum communication between two parties, say Alice and Bob. For this reason one needs to consider quantum repeaters [11], i.e., intermediate relay stations which are meant to assist any point-to-point implementation.

This work is directly addressed to the core of this problem. We investigate the optimal rates which are achievable for quantum communication (QC), entanglement distillation (ED) or quantum key distribution (QKD) between two parties, who can exploit unlimited two-way classical communication (CC) and adaptive local operations (LOs), also known as adaptive LOCCs. We assume that the two parties are directly connected by a quantum channel and they do not pre-share any entanglement. In such a situation, we study the various two-way assisted capacities of the channel for QC, ED and QKD which set the ultimate limits achievable in the absence of repeaters.

By applying a technique of teleportation stretching [12] to suitable "stretchable" channels in arbitrary dimension, we are able to greatly reduce the complexity of any quantum protocol based on adaptive LOCCs. The result is a simple protocol where each transmission through the channel is replaced by a Choi matrix, and the adaptive LOCCs are all collapsed into a single final LOCC. This allows us to bound the optimal rates for QC, ED and QKD by a single quantity, that we call "entanglement flux" and represents the maximum entanglement that may survive the channel. This quantity is computed for an arbitrary single-mode Gaussian channel (extending the results of Ref. [12]) and for several discrete-variable channels, including all qubit Pauli channels.

By showing coincidence with lower bounds, we prove a number of exact formulas. We show that the two-way assisted quantum capacity Q_2 and the secret-key capacity K of the quantum-limited amplifier are $Q_2 = K = \log_2[g/(g-1)]$ where g is the gain. We then show that the qubit dephasing channel has two-way assisted capacities $Q_2 = K = 1 - H_2(p)$, where H_2 is the binary Shannon entropy and p is the dephasing probability. We also extend this result to arbitrary dimension. Finally, we also determine the secret-key capacity of the qubit erasure channel, which is $K = 1 - p$. It is worth to mention that, before our study, the only two-way assisted capacities that were known were those (K and Q_2) of the pure-loss channel [12] and Q_2 of the erasure channel [13].

Adaptive quantum communication in arbitrary dimension

Suppose that Alice and Bob are separated by a quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$ and they want to implement the most general protocol assisted by adaptive LOCCs, with the aim of distributing entanglement, quantum information or secret keys. We assume that Alice and Bob have countable sets of systems, denoted by $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$, respectively.

The first step is the preparation of the initial state of $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ by LOCC Λ_1. Next, Alice picks a system $a_1 \in \mathbf{a}$ which is sent through the channel $\mathcal{E}$. Once Bob gets the output b_1, the parties apply LOCC Λ_2 on all systems $\mathbf{a}b_1\mathbf{b}$. Let us update Bob's set by including b_1, i.e., $b_1\mathbf{b} \to \mathbf{b}$. In the second transmission, Alice sends another

system $a_2 \in \mathbf{a}$ through $\mathcal{E}$ resulting into an output b_2 for Bob. The parties apply further LOCC Λ_3 on all systems $\mathbf{a}b_2\mathbf{b}$. Bob's set is updated and so on. After n transmissions, Alice and Bob will share a state $\rho^n_{\mathbf{ab}}$ depending on the sequence of adaptive LOCCs $\mathcal{L} = \{\Lambda_1, \cdots, \Lambda_{n+1}\}$.

This adaptive protocol has a rate of R^n if $\|\rho^n_{\mathbf{ab}} - \phi_n\| \leq \varepsilon$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the trace norm and ϕ_n is a target state with nR^n bits. If the parties implement entanglement distillation (ED), the target state is a maximally-entangled state and R^n_{ED} is the number of entanglement bits (ebit) per use. If the parties implement QKD, the target state is a private state [14] with secret-key rate $R^n_{\text{K}} \geq R^n_{\text{ED}}$ [15]. By taking the limit of $n \to +\infty$ and optimizing over all the protocols $\mathcal{L}$, one can define the two-way entanglement distillation capacity D_2 and the secret-key capacity K of the channel as follows

$$D_2(\mathcal{E}) := \sup_{\mathcal{L}} \lim_n R^n_{\text{ED}} \leq K(\mathcal{E}) := \sup_{\mathcal{L}} \lim_n R^n_{\text{K}}. \tag{1}$$

Note that an ebit can teleport a qubit and a qubit can distribute an ebit: These processes are fully equivalent in the presence of unlimited two-way CCs. Thus, $D_2(\mathcal{E})$ coincides with the two-way quantum capacity $Q_2(\mathcal{E})$ of the channel. All these capacities can be bounded by introducing suitable quantities. From below we may consider the (reverse) coherent information [16–19] of the channel $I_{(R)C}(\mathcal{E})$, which we define as the (reverse) coherent information computed on its Choi matrix (see Methods for definitions). In particular, we have $I_C(\mathcal{E}) \leq Q^{(1)}(\mathcal{E})$, where $Q^{(1)}$ is the one-shot unassisted quantum capacity of the channel. These quantities not only are computable but, thanks to the hashing inequality [20], they represent achievable rates for one-way entanglement distillation and, therefore, are lower bounds of $D_2(\mathcal{E})$.

From above we may resort to the relative entropy of entanglement (REE) [21]. Recall that, for any bipartite state ρ, this is defined as $E_R(\rho) = \min_{\sigma \in \text{SEP}} S(\rho||\sigma)$, where SEP are separable states and $S(\rho||\sigma) := \text{Tr}\left[\rho(\log_2 \rho - \log_2 \sigma)\right]$ is the relative entropy [22]. Then, Ref. [12] showed that

$$K(\mathcal{E}) \leq E_R(\mathcal{E}) := \sup_{\mathcal{L}} \limsup_n n^{-1} E_R(\rho^n_{\mathbf{ab}}) \ , \tag{2}$$

in any dimension. The REE bound $E_R(\mathcal{E})$ is generally very hard to compute. Remarkably, its calculation can be enormously simplified if the channel suitably "commutes" with teleportation.

Stretching of adaptive protocols

Denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the set of teleportation unitaries in arbitrary dimension d. For a qudit ($d < +\infty$), the teleportation set $\mathcal{S}$ is composed by generalized Pauli operators T_k with $k = 1, \ldots, 2^d$. These are the generators of a finite-dimensional Weyl-Heisenberg group or Pauli group (see Methods). For a bosonic system ($d = +\infty$), the set $\mathcal{S}$ is composed by displacement operators T_k with complex k [7], which form the infinite-dimensional Weyl-Heisenberg group. By definition, we say that a quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$ is "stretchable" by teleportation if, for any $T_k \in \mathcal{S}$ and any input state ρ, we may write

$$\mathcal{E}(T_k \rho T_k^\dagger) = U_k \mathcal{E}(\rho) U_k^\dagger \ , \tag{3}$$

for some unitary U_k.

Typically, the condition of Eq. (3) is satisfied with $U_k \in \mathcal{S}$, i.e., the channel is covariant with the Weyl-Heisenberg group. All qubit Pauli channels are stretchable, because Pauli operators commute or anticommute one with each other. Then, all bosonic Gaussian channels are stretchable since they linearly transform the quadratures, so that input displacements are mapped into output ones. Clearly, there exist channels which are not stretchable, an example being the amplitude damping channel [23].

Quantum communication over a stretchable channel can be greatly simplified. In fact, the previous adaptive protocol can be suitably "stretched" in time and reduced into a non-adaptive protocol where channels are replaced by their Choi matrices and the adaptive LOCCs are collapsed into a single final LOCC. This is possible by introducing, before each use of the channel, an ideal teleportation circuit which is composed by an ideal EPR source, i.e., a maximally-entangled state, and a corresponding Bell detection. The whole process is shown in Fig. 1. See Methods for more details on ideal teleportation and the detailed maths of teleportation stretching.

Remarkably, an adaptive protocol over n uses of a stretchable channel $\mathcal{E}$ reduces to n Choi matrices $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ plus a trace-preserving LOCC $\bar{\Lambda}$, i.e., the output reads

$$\rho^n_{\mathbf{ab}} = \bar{\Lambda}\left(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{\otimes n}\right). \tag{4}$$

This reduction of the output state greatly simplifies the computation of any entanglement measure which is non-increasing under trace-preserving LOCC and subadditive on tensor products. This is exactly the case of the REE, for which we may write $E_R(\rho^n_{\mathbf{ab}}) \leq nE_R(\rho_{\mathcal{E}})$. By replacing in Eq. (2), we obtain $K(\mathcal{E}) \leq E_R(\mathcal{E}) = E_R(\rho_{\mathcal{E}})$.

Now, let us define the entanglement flux $\Phi(\mathcal{E})$ of a channel $\mathcal{E}$ as the REE of its Choi matrix, i.e., $\Phi(\mathcal{E}) := E_R\left(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}\right)$. For a stretchable channel, this quantity represents the maximum amount of entanglement (as quantified by the REE) which can be distributed through the channel by means of adaptive protocols, i.e., $E_R(\mathcal{E})$. It is clearly zero for an entanglement-breaking channel, while it is maximum for the identity channel $\mathcal{I}$, for which $\Phi(\mathcal{I}) = \log_2 d$ with d being the dimension of the Hilbert space (unbounded for CVs). By combining all previous results, we have that the two-way assisted capacities of a stretchable channel $\mathcal{E}$ are upperbounded by its entanglement flux, i.e.,

$$\max\{I_C, I_{RC}\} \leq D_2 = Q_2 \leq K \leq \Phi. \tag{5}$$



FIG. 1: **Stretching of an adaptive protocol.** Time flows from left to right, Alice is at the top and Bob at the bottom. In panel (i) we show the first transmission $a_1 \to b_1$ over channel $\mathcal{E}$, which occurs between two LOCCs Λ_1 and Λ_2 performed by the parties on their ensembles of systems **a** and **b**. In panel (ii) we insert an ideal teleportation circuit, just before the channel. This is composed by an ideal EPR state $\Phi^{\rm EPR}$ of systems A_1 and A_1' (orange triangle), and a Bell detection performed on systems a_1 and A_1 (green triangle). As a result, a_1 is perfectly teleported into the new input A_1' up to a k-dependent unitary T_k. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is stretchable, T_k is mapped into an output unitary U_k on system B_1. This unitary is erased by Bob in the second modified LOCC Λ_2^k upon receving the CC of k from Alice. In panel (iii) we anticipate the distribution of the EPR source and post-pone the Bell detection after the channel. In panel (iv) we show the final result, which is a simple protocol where the Choi-matrix of the channel $\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = (\mathcal{I}\otimes\mathcal{E})(\Phi^{\rm EPR})$ is subject to a final LOCC Λ, combining the previous adaptive LOCCs. The action of Λ over $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$ does not depend on the outcome k. This means that we can replace Λ by the mean LOCC $\bar{\Lambda}$ averaged over the Bell outcomes, which is trace-preserving [34, 35]. The full stretching of the protocol can be done iteratively. As shown in panel (v), once the first transmission is stretched, it becomes the input for the second transmission, which is in turn stretched into another Choi-matrix. All the adaptive LOCCs Λ_1, Λ_2 and Λ_3, reduce to a single final trace-preserving LOCC $\bar{\Lambda}$, applied to all Choi-matrices. The extension to arbitrary n is straightforward and leads to the output state in Eq. (4).

Note that the entanglement flux is convex with respect to compositions of quantum channels. In other words, for any mean channel $\overline{\mathcal{E}} = \sum_i p_i \mathcal{E}_i$, defined for an ensemble of channels $\{p_i, \mathcal{E}_i\}$, we may write

$$\Phi(\overline{\mathcal{E}}) \leq \sum_i p_i \Phi(\mathcal{E}_i). \tag{6}$$

In particular, for ensembles of stretchable channels, the mean channel $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ is also stretchable. Thus, combining Eqs. (5) and (6), one has an upper bound for the two-way assisted capacities of $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$.

Bosonic Gaussian channels

We can now investigate the ultimate rates of quantum communication and secret key generation over the most important channels. In particular, we consider here all single-mode Gaussian channels in canonical form [24, 25], extending the analysis of Ref. [12]. We present the results for the most important forms (amplifier and additive-noise channels) leaving secondary forms in the Methods.

For bosonic systems, the ideal EPR state $\Phi^{\rm EPR}$ has infinite energy, which means that the computation of the entanglement flux of a Gaussian channel involves an asymptotic limit. This is done by considering a sequence of finite-energy EPR states $\Phi_\mu^{\rm EPR}$, which are two-mode squeezed vacuum states with variance μ [24]. In the limit of large μ, this sequence converges to $\Phi^{\rm EPR}$ in trace norm, so that we can exploit the lower semicontinuity of the relative entropy and write $\Phi(\mathcal{E}) = E_R(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}) \leq \liminf_\mu E_R(\rho_\mu)$ where $\rho_\mu := (\mathcal{I}\otimes\mathcal{E})(\Phi_\mu^{\rm EPR})$.

In this way, Ref. [12] determined a weak converse rate for quantum communication over a thermal-loss channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm loss}$ with transmissivity $0 \leq g \leq 1$ and thermal noise $\bar{n}$. More precisely, Ref. [12] found the upper bound

$$\Phi(g,\bar{n}) \leq -\log_2\left[(1-g)g^{\bar{n}}\right] - h(\bar{n}) \quad \text{for } \bar{n} < \frac{g}{1-g}, \tag{7}$$

and $\Phi(g,\bar{n}) = 0$ otherwise. In the previous formula we set $h(x) := (x+1)\log_2(x+1) - x\log_2 x$. For the pure-loss channel ($\bar{n}=0$), this bound coincides with the reverse coherent information of the channel, therefore establishing all its two-way capacities $Q_2(g) = K(g) = -\log_2(1-g)$.

Note that free-space satellite communications in the presence of atmospheric turbulence may be modelled as an average of pure-loss channels $\mathcal{E}_i$ with transmissivities $g_i \in [0,1]$ and associated probabilities p_i [26]. For such a channel $\overline{\mathcal{E}} = \sum_i p_i \mathcal{E}_i$ we can exploit the convexity of the entanglement flux and write the upper bound

$$\Phi(\overline{\mathcal{E}}) \leq -\sum_i p_i \log_2(1-g_i)\ . \tag{8}$$

Consider the amplifier channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp}$, whose action on input quadratures $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \sqrt{g}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sqrt{g-1}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_E$ where $g>1$ is the gain and E is a thermal environment with $\bar{n}$ mean photons. For this channel, we compute

$$\Phi(g,\bar{n}) \leq \log_2\left(\frac{g^{\bar{n}+1}}{g-1}\right) - h(\bar{n}) \quad \text{for } \bar{n} < (g-1)^{-1}, \tag{9}$$

and $\Phi(g,\bar{n}) = 0$ otherwise (see Methods). The best known lower bound is given by the coherent information of the channel $I_C(\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp}) = \log_2[g/(g-1)] - h(\bar{n})$ [27].

In particular, for the quantum-limited amplifier ($\bar{n} = 0$), we find that the previous upper and lower bounds coincide, thus determining its two-way assisted capacities

$$Q_2(g) = K(g) = \log_2\left(\frac{g}{g-1}\right). \tag{10}$$

They turn out to coincide with the unassisted quantum capacity Q of the channel [27, 28]. The result of Eq. (10) sets the fundamental limit for secret-key generation, entanglement distillation and quantum communication with amplifiers. A trivial consequence of the formula is that infinite amplification is useless. For an amplifier with typical gain 2, the maximum achievable rate for quantum communication is just 1 qubit per use.

Now consider the additive-noise Gaussian channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm add}$, whose action is $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \hat{\mathbf{x}} + (z,z)^T$ where z is a classical Gaussian variable with zero mean and variance $\xi \geq 0$. For this channel we find (see Methods)

$$\Phi(\xi) \leq \frac{\xi - 1}{\ln 2} - \log_2 \xi \quad \text{for } \xi < 1, \tag{11}$$

and $\Phi(\xi) = 0$ otherwise. The best lower bound is its coherent information $I_C(\mathcal{E}_{\rm add}) = -1/\ln 2 - \log_2 \xi$ [27]. In Fig. 2 we explicitly show that our upper bounds, computed from the relative entropy of entanglement, are the tightest in the literature, e.g., compared with previous results in Refs. [27, 29–31]. The two-way assisted capacities (K and $Q_2 = D_2$) of these Gaussian channels are in the shadowed areas. For both $\mathcal{E}_{\rm loss}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp}$, these areas shrink to a single line for $\bar{n} = 0$.

It is interesting to note how quantum communication rapidly degrades when we compose quantum channels. For instance, a quantum-limited amplifier with gain 2 can transmit $Q_2 = 1$ qubit per use from Alice to Bob. This is the same amount which can be transmitted from Bob to Charlie, through a pure-loss channel with transmissivity 1/2. By using Charlie as a quantum repeater, Alice can therefore transmit at least 1 qubit per use to Bob. If we remove Charlie, and we compose the two channels, we obtain an additive-noise Gaussian channel with variance $\xi = 1/2$, for which $Q_2 \lesssim 0.278$ qubits per use.



FIG. 2: Plots of the bounds for single-mode Gaussian channels in terms of the relevant channel parameters. (i) Thermal-loss channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm loss}$ ($g < 1$), studied in Ref. [12], and amplifier channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp}$ ($g > 1$) with $\bar{n} = 1$ thermal photon. The upper bounds in Eqs. (7) and (9) (red solid lines) are compared with the lower bounds (blue solid lines) obtained with the (reverse) coherent information of these channels, i.e., $I_{RC}(\mathcal{E}_{\rm loss})$ [19] and $I_C(\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp})$ [27]. The two-way assisted capacities are contained in the shadowed areas. We also show the upper bounds derived in Ref. [29, 30] (dotted) and Ref. [31] (dashed) based on the squashed entanglement. (ii) Additive-noise channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm add}$ with classical Gaussian noise ξ. We compare our upper bound of Eq. (11) with the best lower bound $I_C(\mathcal{E}_{\rm add})$ [27]. We also show the previous upper bounds of Ref. [30] (dotted), Ref. [31] (dashed), and Ref. [27] (dot-dashed).

Discrete-variable channels

We now study the ultimate limit for secret key generation, entanglement distillation and quantum communication through basic channels in finite dimension. Let us start with the qubit erasure channel which is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{\rm erase}(\rho) = (1-p)\rho + p|2\rangle\langle 2|, \tag{12}$$

where $\langle 2|\rho|2\rangle = 0$ for any input ρ. In the Methods, we compute its entanglement flux $\Phi(\mathcal{E}_{\rm erase}) \leq 1 - p$. Because $Q_2(\mathcal{E}_{\rm erase}) = 1 - p$ [13] and $Q_2 \leq K \leq \Phi$, this automatically establishes its secret-key capacity

$$K(\mathcal{E}_{\rm erase}) = 1 - p\ . \tag{13}$$

Let us compute the entanglement flux of a generic Pauli channel $\mathcal{P}$ acting on qubits. This can be written as

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho) = \sum_k p_k P_k \rho P_k, \tag{14}$$

where $P_k \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$ are Pauli operators [22, 32] and $\mathbf{p} = \{p_k\}$ is a probability distribution. It is known that its (reverse) coherent information is $I_{(R)C}(\mathcal{P}) = 1 - H(\mathbf{p})$, where $H(\cdot)$ is the Shannon entropy. We prove that

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}) \leq 1 + H_2(p_1 + p_2) - H(\mathbf{p})\ , \tag{15}$$

where $H_2(\cdot)$ is the binary Shannon entropy (see Methods). We now specialize this result for the depolarizing and dephasing channels.

The depolarizing channel is a qubit Pauli channel with probability distribution $\mathbf{p} = \{1-3p/4, p/4, p/4, p/4\}$. For this channel, we have $\Phi(\mathcal{P}_{\rm depol}) \leq f(p)$ where

$$f(p) := 1 + H_2\left(\frac{p}{2}\right) - H_2\left(\frac{3p}{4}\right) - \frac{3p}{4}\log_2 3 \ , \qquad (16)$$

which may be improved into

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}_{\rm depol}) \leq \min_{\epsilon}(1-\alpha)f(\epsilon) \ , \qquad (17)$$

where $\alpha = (p-\epsilon)/(2/3-\epsilon)$ and $0 \leq \epsilon \leq p \leq 2/3$ (see Methods). This bound is close to (but do not improve) that derived from the squashed entanglement [31].

Finally, consider the dephasing channel $\mathcal{P}_{\rm deph}$, which is a qubit Pauli channel with $\mathbf{p} = \{p, 0, 0, 1-p\}$. From Eq. (15) we derive $\Phi \leq 1 - H_2(p) = I_C$, which implies

$$Q_2(\mathcal{P}_{\rm deph}) = K(\mathcal{P}_{\rm deph}) = 1 - H_2(p) \ . \qquad (18)$$

Thus we determine the two-way capacities of this channel, which turn out to coincide with its unassisted quantum capacity Q [33]. This result can be extended to arbitrary dimension d.

Consider a qudit with basis $\{|j\rangle\}$ with $j = 0, \ldots, d-1$. The generalized phase operator is $Z|j\rangle = \omega^j |j\rangle$ with $\omega := \exp(i2\pi/d)$, and the generalized dephasing channel with probability p has Kraus representation

$$\mathcal{P}^d_{\rm deph}(\rho) = \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} P_m Z^m \rho (Z^m)^\dagger, \qquad (19)$$

where $P_m := \binom{d-1}{m} p^m (1-p)^{d-1-m}$. Let us set $\mathbf{P} = \{P_m\}$, then we find (see Methods)

$$Q_2(\mathcal{P}^d_{\rm deph}) = K(\mathcal{P}^d_{\rm deph}) = \log_2 d - H(\mathbf{P}). \qquad (20)$$

Conclusions

In this work we have studied the ultimate rates of quantum communication, entanglement distillation and key distribution between two parties who are connected by a stretchable channel, which suitably commutes with teleportation. Thanks to this property we have been able to reduce the most general two-way assisted protocol based on adaptive LOCCs into a much simpler non-adaptive protocol, where each use of the channel is mapped into its Choi matrix, and the adaptive LOCCs are collapsed into a single final LOCC.

This simplification allowed us to exploit basic properties of the relative entropy of entanglement, and to compute the entanglement flux of the channel, which provides an upper bound for the various two-way assisted capacities. Remarkably, this upper bound turned out to coincide with known lower bounds for several important quantum channels, such the quantum-limited bosonic amplifier, the dephasing channel in arbitrary dimension and the qubit erasure channel, for which the various two-way assisted capacities are now fully established.

In the absence of pre-shared entanglement, the entanglement flux of a stretchable channel can only be surpassed by using a quantum repeater. For this reason, our results provide the most general and precise benchmarks for testing the rate performance of quantum repeaters in both discrete- and continous-variable settings.

Acknowledgments. This work has been supported by the EPSRC via the 'UK Quantum Communications HUB' (EP/M013472/1) and 'qDATA' (EP/L011298/1). S.P. would like to thank S. L. Braunstein, G. Spedalieri, and M. M. Wilde for comments.

METHODS

Ideal teleportation

Ideal teleportation is based on the use of an ideal EPR state $\Phi^{\rm EPR}_{AA'}$ of systems A and A'. For a qudit of arbitrary dimension d, this is a generalized Bell state, i.e., maximally entangled state of the form

$$\Phi^{\rm EPR}_{AA'} = d^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_{A'} \ . \qquad (21)$$

In particular, it is the usual Bell state $(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ for a qubit. For CVs, one has to take the limit of $d \to +\infty$ in Eq. (21); this is a two-mode squeezed vacuum state [24] with infinite energy, i.e., realizing $\hat{q}_A = \hat{q}_{A'}$ for position and $\hat{p}_A = -\hat{p}_{A'}$ for momentum. Such unbounded state must always be considered in this limit.

Correspondingly, we consider an ideal Bell detection acting on systems a and A, which is a projection on Bell states Φ^k_{aA} where the label k (outcome of the measurement) takes 2^d possible values for qudits, while it is complex for CVs [7]. More precisely, the ideal Bell detection is a POVM with generic measurement operator

$$\Phi^k_{aA} := (T^a_k \otimes I^A)^\dagger \Phi^{\rm EPR}_{aA} (T^a_k \otimes I^A) \ , \qquad (22)$$

where T_k is a teleportation unitary. At any dimension d, we call teleportation set $\mathcal{S}_d$, the set of all teleportation unitaries. For $d < +\infty$ (qudit), $\mathcal{S}_d$ is composed by d^2 generalized Pauli operators. For $d = +\infty$ (CV system), $\mathcal{S}_\infty$ is composed by infinite displacement operators [24].

Let us better characterize the teleportation set. Denote by $\{|j\rangle\}$ the computational basis of a qudit, with $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d := \{0, \ldots, d-1\}$. Any qudit unitary can be expanded in terms of d^2 generalized Pauli operators $X^a Z^b$

with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. These are defined by the following unitary (non-Hermitian) operators

$$X\left|j\right\rangle = \left|j \oplus 1\right\rangle \ , \ Z\left|j\right\rangle = \omega^j \left|j\right\rangle \ , \tag{23}$$

where $\oplus$ is the modulo d addition and $\omega := \exp(i2\pi/d)$. Thus we have $\mathcal{S}_d = \{X^a Z^b\}$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Note that, from $\mathcal{S}$, we may construct the set of finite-dimensional displacement operators $D(j, a, b) := \omega^j X^a Z^b$ with $j, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ which forms the finite-dimensional Weyl-Heisenberg group (or Pauli group). For instance, for a qubit ($d = 2$), we have $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{I, X, XZ, Z\}$ and the group $\pm 1 \times \{I, X, XZ, Z\}$. For CV systems, $\mathcal{S}_\infty = \{D(k)\}$ with k complex and $D(k)$ being a displacement operator [24]. This is the infinite-dimensional Weyl-Heisenberg group.

Given an arbitrary state ρ on some input system a, this is perfectly teleported onto A' by the following procedure. System a and EPR system A are subject to Bell detection. For any given outcome k, the other EPR system A' is projected onto $T_k \rho T_k^\dagger$ where $T_k \in \mathcal{S}_d$. The last step is the CC of the outcome k, which allows one to undo the teleportation unitary by applying $T_k^\dagger$ to system A'. Note that this process also teleports all correlations that the input system a may have with other ancillary systems. In the following Methods' section we consider the presence of a channel and the full mathematics of the stretching mechanism.

Detailed maths of teleportation stretching

Refer to the scenario depicted in panel (ii) of Fig. 1, where we insert an ideal teleportation circuit before the use of the channel $\mathcal{E}$. For simplicity drop the index from the transmitted systems, so that we have an ideal EPR state $\Phi^{\rm EPR}_{AA'}$ of systems A and A' and an ideal Bell detection of systems a and A. System A' is transformed into the output B by the action of the channel. Let us consider the initial state $\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}}$ coming from the application of the first LOCC $\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} = \Lambda_1(\sigma_{\mathbf{a}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathbf{b}})$ on Alice's and Bob's local states $\sigma_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{b}}$. Including the ideal EPR state, we have the global state $\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \Phi^{\rm EPR}_{AA'}$. Performing the Bell detection on systems a and A, with outcome Φ^k_{aA} and probability p_k, leads to the global state

$$\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}AA'} := \Phi^k_{aA}(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \Phi^{\rm EPR}_{AA'})\Phi^{k\dagger}_{aA} \tag{24}$$

$$= \Phi^k_{aA} \otimes \rho^k_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}} \ . \tag{25}$$

where

$$\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}} = T_k^{A'} \rho_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}} T_k^{A'\dagger} \ . \tag{26}$$

For simplicity of notation, we omit identities when they are involved in tensor products with other operators.

Proof. From the definition of the previous global state and using $\Phi^k_{aA} = \left|\Phi^k\right\rangle_{aA}\left\langle\Phi^k\right|$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}AA'} &= \left|\Phi^k\right\rangle_{aA}\left\langle\Phi^k\right| (\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \Phi^{\rm EPR}_{AA'}) \left|\Phi^k\right\rangle_{aA}\left\langle\Phi^k\right| \\ &= \Phi^k_{aA} \otimes \rho^k_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}} \ ,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}} :=& {}_{aA}\left\langle\Phi^{\rm EPR}\right| T_k^a \ \rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \\ &\otimes \left|\Phi^{\rm EPR}\right\rangle_{AA'}\left\langle\Phi^{\rm EPR}\right| T_k^{a\dagger} \left|\Phi^{\rm EPR}\right\rangle_{aA} \ .\end{aligned}$$

Up to normalizations, we may write

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}} &= \sum_{ijlm} {}_{aA}\left\langle ii\right| T_k^a \ \rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \left|jj\right\rangle_{AA'} {}_{AA'}\left\langle ll\right| T_k^{a\dagger} \left|mm\right\rangle_{aA} \\ &= \sum_{il} {}_a\left\langle i\right| T_k^a \ \rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \ T_k^{a\dagger} \left|l\right\rangle_a \otimes \left|i\right\rangle_{A'}\left\langle l\right| \\ &= M_{a\to A'} \ T_k^a \ \rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \ T_k^{a\dagger} \ M^\dagger_{a\to A'} \\ &= T_k^{A'} \ \rho_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}} \ T_k^{A'\dagger},\end{aligned}$$

where $M_{a\to A'} := \sum_i \left|i\right\rangle_{A'} {}_a\left\langle i\right|$ maps a into system A'. ■

Now let us apply channel $\mathcal{E}_{A'}$ to the conditional global state $\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}AA'} = \Phi^k_{aA} \otimes \rho^k_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}}$. Using Eq. (26) we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}B\mathbf{b}} &= \mathcal{E}_{A'}\left[T_k^{A'} \rho_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}} T_k^{A'\dagger}\right] \\ &= U_k^B \ \mathcal{E}_{A'}(\rho_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}}) \ U_k^{B\dagger} \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where we have used the fact that $\mathcal{E}$ is stretchable. Then, Bob applies the inverse unitary $U_k^{B\dagger}$ which provides

$$\rho_{\mathbf{a}B\mathbf{b}} = \mathcal{E}_{A'}(\rho_{\mathbf{a}A'\mathbf{b}}) = \mathcal{E}_a(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}}) \ , \tag{28}$$

where we have re-labeled $A' \to a$ in the last equality.

Note that the output state $\rho_{\mathbf{a}B\mathbf{b}}$ is independent on the outcome k of the Bell detection and corresponds to the output state that one would achieve by direct transmission of system a through the channel, as depicted in panel (i) of Fig. 1. The final step is the LOCC Λ_2 which provides

$$\rho_{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}} = \Lambda_2(\rho_{\mathbf{a}B\mathbf{b}}) \ .$$

As a matter of fact, the second LOCC is globally described by $\Lambda_2^k = \Lambda_2 \circ \mathcal{U}_k^B$ where $\mathcal{U}_k^B(\rho) = U_k^{B\dagger} \rho U_k^B$.

Now let us apply the same operations to $\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}AA'}$ when it is written in the equivalent form of Eq. (24). After the channel we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{A'}\left(\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}AA'}\right) &= \mathcal{E}_{A'}\left[\Phi^k_{aA}(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \Phi^{\rm EPR}_{AA'})\Phi^{k\dagger}_{aA}\right] \\ &= \Phi^k_{aA}\left[\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{A'}\left(\Phi^{\rm EPR}_{AA'}\right)\right]\Phi^{k\dagger}_{aA} \\ &= \Phi^k_{aA}\left(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \rho^{AB}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\Phi^{k\dagger}_{aA} \\ &= \mathcal{B}^k_{aA}\left(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \rho^{AB}_{\mathcal{E}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho^{AB}_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the Choi matrix of the channel $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{B}^k_{aA}(\rho) := \Phi^k_{aA}\rho\Phi^{k\dagger}_{aA}$. Then, Bob applies the conditional LO $\mathcal{U}_k^B$ so that we get

$$\rho^k_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}AB} = \mathcal{U}_k^B \circ \mathcal{B}^k_{aA}\left(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \rho^{AB}_{\mathcal{E}}\right),$$

By tracing over systems a and A, we must retrieve the reduced state in Eq. (28), which does not depend on k, i.e., we have

$$\rho_{\mathbf{a}B\mathbf{b}} = {\rm Tr}_{aA}\left[\mathcal{U}_k^B \circ \mathcal{B}^k_{aA}\left(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \rho^{AB}_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\right].$$

Finally, we apply the LOCC Λ_2 to systems $\mathbf{a}B\mathbf{b}$, so that we have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\mathbf{ab}} &= \Lambda_2(\rho_{\mathbf{a}B\mathbf{b}}) = \mathrm{Tr}_{aA}\left[\Lambda_2^k \circ \mathcal{B}_{aA}^k\left(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{AB}\right)\right] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{aA}\left\{\Lambda_2^k \circ \mathcal{B}_{aA}^k\left[\Lambda_1(\sigma_{\mathbf{a}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathbf{b}}) \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{AB}\right]\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The last expression in Eq. (29) describes the stretched scenario in the panel (iii) of Fig. 1.

It is clear that $\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}$ does not depend on k. This means that it is equal to the mean state obtained by averaging over the Bell outcomes. In other words, we may write

$$\rho_{\mathbf{ab}} = \sum_k p_k \rho_{\mathbf{ab}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{aA}\left[\Delta\left(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{AB}\right)\right], \quad (30)$$

where

$$\Delta := \sum_k p_k (\Lambda_2^k \circ \mathcal{B}_{aA}^k) \quad (31)$$

is a trace-preserving LOCC. In the first transmission, the state $\rho_{\mathbf{a}a\mathbf{b}}$ is prepared locally, so that we may simplify Eq. (30) into the following

$$\rho_{\mathbf{ab}} = \bar{\Lambda}(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{AB}), \quad (32)$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}$ is a trace-preserving LOCC. This is the scenario depicted in panel (iv) of Fig. 1.

Iteration rule

We can easily show that, by iteration, we can stretch all the transmission instances of the adaptive protocol, as in panel (v) of Fig. 1. Let us introduce the label $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ to denote the various systems and operations associated with the ith transmission. We can modify Eq. (30) into

$$\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^i = \mathrm{Tr}_{a_i A_i}\left[\Delta_i\left(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a_i\mathbf{b}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_i B_i}\right)\right] \quad (33)$$

where

$$\rho_{\mathbf{a}a_i\mathbf{b}} = \rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^{i-1}, \quad \rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^0 = \Lambda_1(\sigma_{\mathbf{a}} \otimes \sigma_{\mathbf{b}}). \quad (34)$$

Thus, for $n = 2$ transmissions, we may write

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^2 &= \mathrm{Tr}_{a_2 A_2}\left[\Delta_2\left(\rho_{\mathbf{a}a_2\mathbf{b}} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_2 B_2}\right)\right] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{a_2 A_2}\left[\Delta_2\left(\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^1 \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_2 B_2}\right)\right] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{a_2 A_2}\left\{\Delta_2\left\{\mathrm{Tr}_{a_1 A_1}\left[\Delta_1\left(\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_1 B_1}\right)\right] \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_2 B_2}\right\}\right\} \\ &\overset{(*)}{=} \mathrm{Tr}_{a_1 a_2 A_1 A_2}\left\{\Delta_2\left[\Delta_1\left(\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_1 B_1}\right) \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_2 B_2}\right]\right\} \\ &\overset{(*)}{=} \mathrm{Tr}_{a_1 a_2 A_1 A_2}\left[\Delta_2 \circ \Delta_1\left(\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^0 \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_1 B_1} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_2 B_2}\right)\right] \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where in $(*)$ we exploit the fact that the LOCC Δ_i acts on systems $\mathbf{ab}a_i A_i B_i$. Because $\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^0$ is prepared locally, we may simplified Eq. (35) into

$$\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^2 = \bar{\Lambda}\left(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_1 B_1} \otimes \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_2 B_2}\right). \quad (36)$$

By iterating n times Eqs. (33) and (34), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^n &= \mathrm{Tr}_{a_1 \ldots a_n A_1 \ldots A_n}\left[\Delta_n \circ \cdots \circ \Delta_1\left(\rho_{\mathbf{ab}}^0 \otimes \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_i B_i}\right)\right] \\ &= \bar{\Lambda}\left(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}^{\otimes n}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

(Reverse) coherent information of a channel

Consider a quantum channel $\mathcal{E}$ which is applied to some input state ρ_A of system A. Let us introduce an auxiliary system R and consider the purification $|\psi\rangle_{RA}$ of ρ_A. We can therefore consider the extended channel $\rho_{RB} = (\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$. By definition, the coherent information for channel $\mathcal{E}$ and the input state ρ_A is [16, 17]

$$I_C(\mathcal{E}, \rho_A) = S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{RB}), \quad (38)$$

where $S(\cdot)$ is the von Neumann entropy and $\rho_B = \mathrm{Tr}_R(\rho_{RB})$. This is also denoted as

$$I_C(\mathcal{E}, \rho_A) = I(A\rangle B)_{\rho_{RB}}. \quad (39)$$

Similarly, the reverse coherent information is [18, 19]

$$I_{RC}(\mathcal{E}, \rho_A) = S(\rho_R) - S(\rho_{RB}), \quad (40)$$

where $\rho_R = \mathrm{Tr}_B(\rho_{RB})$. This is also denoted as

$$I_{RC}(\mathcal{E}, \rho_A) = I(A\langle B)_{\rho_{RB}}. \quad (41)$$

When the input state ρ_A is a maximally-mixed state, its purification is a maximally-entangled state Φ_{RA}^{EPR}, so that ρ_{RB} is the Choi-matrix of the channel, i.e., $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}$. We then define the coherent information of the channel as

$$I_C(\mathcal{E}) = I(A\rangle B)_{\rho_{\mathcal{E}}}. \quad (42)$$

Similarly, its reverse coherent information is

$$I_{RC}(\mathcal{E}) = I(A\langle B)_{\rho_{\mathcal{E}}}. \quad (43)$$

These quantities are computable in any dimension and they are achievable rates for one-way assisted entanglement distillation, according to the hashing inequality [20] which also applies to energy-constrained states in infinite dimension and suitable limits for infinite energy [12]. It is clear that $I_C(\mathcal{E})$ is a lower bound for the one-shot (unassisted or forward-assisted) quantum capacity of the channel, i.e.,

$$I_C(\mathcal{E}) \leq Q^{(1)}(\mathcal{E}) = \max_{|\psi\rangle} I_C(\mathcal{E}, \rho_A). \quad (44)$$

Indeed, one may have $I_C(\mathcal{E}) = Q^{(1)}(\mathcal{E})$, for instance for the pure-loss channel [27, 28].

Note that for unital channels, i.e., channels preserving the identity $\mathcal{E}(I) = I$, we have $I_C(\mathcal{E}) = I_{RC}(\mathcal{E})$. This is just a consequence of the fact that, the reduced states ρ_A and ρ_R of a maximally entangled state $\Phi_{RA}^{\rm EPR}$ is a maximally-mixed state I/d, where d is the dimension of the Hilbert space (including the limit for $d \to +\infty$). If the channel is unital, also the reduced output state $\rho_B = \mathcal{E}(\rho_A)$ is maximally-mixed. As a result, $S(\rho_B) = S(\rho_A) = S(\rho_R)$ and we may write $I_C(\mathcal{E}) = I_{RC}(\mathcal{E}) := I_{(R)C}(\mathcal{E})$. In the specific case of discrete variable systems ($d < +\infty$), we have $S(\rho_R) = \log_2 d$ and we may write

$$I_{(R)C}(\mathcal{E}) = \log_2 d - S(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}) \ . \tag{45}$$

In particular, for qubits ($d = 2$), one has

$$I_{(R)C}(\mathcal{E}) = 1 - S(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}) \ . \tag{46}$$

Convexity of the entanglement flux

This property is inherited from the convexity of the relative entropy of entanglement. For any ensemble of states $\{p_i, \rho_i\}$ with average $\bar{\rho} = \sum_i p_i \rho_i$, one has [38]

$$E_R(\bar{\rho}) \leq \sum_i p_i E_R(\rho_i) \ . \tag{47}$$

Let us consider the mean channel $\overline{\mathcal{E}} = \sum_i p_i \mathcal{E}_i$, defined for an ensemble of channels $\{p_i, \mathcal{E}_i\}$. In terms of Choi matrices, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}} &:= (I \otimes \overline{\mathcal{E}}) \left(\Phi^{\rm EPR}\right) \\ &= \sum_i p_i (I \otimes \mathcal{E}_i) \left(\Phi^{\rm EPR}\right) = \sum_i p_i \rho_{\mathcal{E}_i} \ . \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we may write

$$\Phi(\overline{\mathcal{E}}) := E_R(\rho_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}}) \leq \sum_i p_i E_R(\rho_{\mathcal{E}_i}) = \sum_i p_i \Phi(\mathcal{E}_i). \tag{48}$$

Entanglement flux of a canonical form

Let us consider a single-mode Gaussian channel. By means of local unitaries this channel can always be put in canonical form [24] whose general action on input quadratures $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{q}, \hat{p})^T$ is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{H}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{E(\bar{n})} + (z, z)^T \ , \tag{49}$$

where $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ are diagonal matrices, $E(\bar{n})$ is an environmental thermal mode with $\bar{n}$ mean photons, and z is a classical Gaussian variable with zero mean and variance $\xi \geq 0$. Depending on the specific form (thermal-loss channel, amplifier etc...) we have different expressions in Eq. (49). For instance, the thermal loss channel has $\mathbf{G} = \sqrt{g}\mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{H} = \sqrt{1-g}\mathbf{I}$ with $0 \leq g \leq 1$ and $\xi = 0$, so that its action is $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \sqrt{g}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sqrt{1-g}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{E(\bar{n})}$. All these channels are clearly stretchable. In fact, the effect of an ideal CV teleportation is the k-dependent phase-space displacement of the input $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{d}_k$, which is just mapped into $\mathbf{d}_k \to \mathbf{G}\mathbf{d}_k$.

Since bosonic systems have an ∞-dimensional Hilbert space, for a canonical form $\mathcal{E}$ we need to compute

$$\Phi(\mathcal{E}) = E_R\left(\rho_{\mathcal{E}}\right) \leq \liminf_{\mu} E_R\left(\rho_\mu\right) \ , \tag{50}$$

where $\rho_\mu := (\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\Phi_\mu^{\rm EPR})$ and $\Phi_\mu^{\rm EPR}$ is a two-mode squeezed vacuum state with variance $\mu \geq 1/2$. This is Gaussian [24] with covariance matrix (CM)

$$V_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} \mu & c \\ c & \mu \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} \mu & -c \\ -c & \mu \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{51}$$

where $c = \sqrt{\mu^2 - 1/4}$. One can easily check that the sequence of states ρ_μ converges (in trace norm) to the target state $\rho_{\mathcal{E}} = (\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\Phi^{\rm EPR})$. This can be done by compute the bound $\|\rho^\mu - \rho_{\mathcal{E}}\| \leq \sqrt{1 - F^2}$ where $F = F(\rho_\mu, \rho_{\mathcal{E}})$ is the fidelity between two Gaussian states [39]. In order to bound the entanglement flux we need to consider a suitable separable state $\tilde{\sigma}$, so that

$$E_R\left(\rho_\mu\right) \leq S(\rho_\mu || \tilde{\sigma}_\mu) = -S(\rho_\mu) - {\rm Tr}\left(\rho_\mu \log_2 \tilde{\sigma}_\mu\right) \ . \tag{52}$$

In the following, we explicitly compute the output state ρ_μ and a corresponding separable state $\tilde{\sigma}_\mu$ for the various canonical forms (apart from the thermal-loss channel already studied in Ref. [12]). These are all zero-mean Gaussian states, so that the calculations reduce to the manipulation of their covariance matrices.

Amplifier

The amplifier channel $\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp}$ corresponds to set $\mathbf{G} = \sqrt{g}\mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{H} = \sqrt{g-1}\mathbf{Z}$ with $g > 1$ and $\xi = 0$ in Eq. (49). Its action is therefore $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \sqrt{g}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sqrt{g-1}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{E(\bar{n})}$. Let us derive the output state $\rho_\mu := (\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{\rm amp})(\Phi_\mu^{\rm EPR})$. It is easy to see that this Gaussian state has CM

$$V_\mu^{\rm amp} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu & c\sqrt{g} \\ c\sqrt{g} & \beta \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} \mu & -c\sqrt{g} \\ -c\sqrt{g} & \beta \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{53}$$

where $\beta := g\mu + (g-1)\omega$ and $\omega := \bar{n} + 1/2$. In the limit of $\mu \to +\infty$, this state describes the Choi matrix of the amplifier $\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp}}$. Computing the minimum partially-transposed symplectic eigenvalue of $V_\mu^{\rm amp}$ and taking the limit of large μ, we can see that the Choi matrix is separable for $\bar{n} \geq (g-1)^{-1}$ which therefore represents the entanglement-breaking threshold for the amplifier channel. In this regime, we clearly have $\Phi(\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp}) = E_R(\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\rm amp}}) = 0$.

For $\bar{n} < (g-1)^{-1}$, we construct the separable Gaussian state $\tilde{\sigma}_\mu$ with CM as in Eq. (53) but with the replacement $c\sqrt{g} \to \sqrt{(\mu-1/2)(\beta-1/2)}$. The relative entropy $S(\rho_\mu||\tilde{\sigma}_\mu)$ can be computed with the formula for Gaussian states of Ref. [12]. In particular, up to $O(\mu^{-1})$, we find the expansions

$$S(\rho_\mu) \to h(\bar{n}) + \log_2 e(g-1)\mu, \tag{54}$$

$$-\mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_\mu \log_2 \tilde{\sigma}_\mu\right) \to \frac{\ln(g\mu^2) + 2 + 4\omega \coth^{-1}\left(\frac{g+1}{g-1}\right)}{2\ln 2}. \tag{55}$$

Using these in Eq. (52) we derive the bound in Eq. (9).

Conjugate of the amplifier

Let us introduce the reflection matrix $\mathbf{Z} = \mathrm{diag}(1,-1)$. The conjugate of the amplifier channel $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathrm{amp}}$ corresponds to set $\mathbf{G} = \sqrt{-g}\mathbf{Z}$, $\mathbf{H} = \sqrt{1-g}\mathbf{I}$ with $g < 0$ and $\xi = 0$ in Eq. (49). Its action is therefore $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \sqrt{-g}\mathbf{Z}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \sqrt{1-g}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{E(\bar{n})}$. It is easy to check that the Choi matrix $\rho_{\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathrm{amp}}}$ is always separable, i.e., this channel is always entanglement-breaking, so that $\Phi(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\mathrm{amp}}) = 0$.

Additive-noise Gaussian channel

This channel $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{add}}$ corresponds to set $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\xi \geq 0$ in Eq. (49). Its action is therefore $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \hat{\mathbf{x}} + (z,z)^T$. For this channel, the output state ρ_μ is Gaussian with zero-mean and CM

$$V_\mu^{\mathrm{add}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu & c \\ c & \mu+\xi \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} \mu & -c \\ -c & \mu+\xi \end{pmatrix}. \tag{56}$$

In the limit of $\mu \to +\infty$, this state becomes the Choi matrix $\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{add}}}$ which is separable for $\xi \geq 1$ (entanglement-breaking threshold for this channel). Thus, we have $\Phi(\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{add}}) = 0$ for $\xi \geq 1$. For $\xi < 1$, we construct the separable Gaussian state $\tilde{\sigma}_\mu$ with CM as in Eq. (56) but with the replacement $c \to \sqrt{(\mu-1/2)(\mu+\xi-1/2)}$. The relative entropy $S(\rho_\mu||\tilde{\sigma}_\mu)$ can be computed with the formula for Gaussian states of Ref. [12]. Up to $O(\mu^{-1/2})$, we find the expansions

$$S(\rho_\mu) \to \log_2(e^2\xi\mu), \tag{57}$$

$$-\mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho_\mu \log_2 \tilde{\sigma}_\mu\right) \to \frac{\ln\left[\frac{(2\mu-1)(2\xi+2\mu-1)}{4}\right] + 2(1+\xi)}{2\ln 2}. \tag{58}$$

By replacing in Eq. (52) we derive the bound of Eq. (11).

Pathological forms

There are some remaining pathological forms to consider. The A_2-form [24] is a 'half' depolarizing channel and corresponds to set $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{diag}(1,0)$, $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{I}$, and $\xi = 0$ in Eq. (49). Its action is $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to (\hat{q},0)^T + \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{E(\bar{n})}$. It is easy to check that this is always an entanglement-breaking channel, so that $\Phi = 0$. Finally, the B_1-form [24] corresponds to setting $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{H} = \mathrm{diag}(0,1)$, $\bar{n} = 0$ and $\xi = 0$ in Eq. (49). Its action is $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \to \hat{\mathbf{x}} + (0,\hat{p}_v)^T$ where v is the vacuum. For this form we find $\Phi = +\infty$.

Entanglement flux of a Pauli channel

Consider a Pauli channel $\mathcal{P}$, whose action on a quantum state ρ can be written as follows

$$\mathcal{P}(\rho) = p_0\rho + p_1 X\rho X + p_2 Y\rho Y + p_3 Z\rho Z, \tag{59}$$

where, $p_i \geq 0\ \forall i$, $\sum_i p_i = 1$, and

$$X := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},\ Y := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix},\ Z := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{60}$$

First of all let us write its Choi matrix in the computational basis. This means that we compute

$$\rho_{\mathcal{P}} = (I \otimes \mathcal{P})(\Phi^{\mathrm{EPR}}),\ \Phi^{\mathrm{EPR}} = \frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \tag{61}$$

After simple algebra we derive

$$\rho_{\mathcal{P}} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} p_0+p3 & 0 & 0 & p_0-p_3 \\ 0 & p_1+p_2 & p_1-p_2 & 0 \\ 0 & p_1-p_2 & p_1+p_2 & 0 \\ p_0-p3 & 0 & 0 & p_0+p_3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{62}$$

This state has spectral decomposition

$$\rho_{\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{k=0}^{3} p_k |k\rangle\langle k|, \tag{63}$$

where the eigenvalues are the probabilities p_k of the Pauli operators $P_k \in \{I,X,Y,Z\}$ and the eigenvectors $\{|k\rangle\}$ form the Bell-like orthogonal basis

$$\left\{\frac{|00\rangle+|11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|01\rangle+|10\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|10\rangle-|01\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{|11\rangle-|00\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}\right\}. \tag{64}$$

Thus, one can compute the von Neumann entropy of the Choi matrix as the Shannon entropy of the probability distribution $\mathbf{p} = \{p_k\}$, i.e., we may write

$$S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}}) = H(\mathbf{p}), \tag{65}$$

where $H(\mathbf{p}) := -\sum_k p_k \log_2 p_k$. This means that the (reverse) coherent information of a Pauli channel is

$$I_{(R)C}(\mathcal{P}) = 1 - H(\mathbf{p}). \tag{66}$$

In fact, a Pauli channel is unital, so that we can combine Eqs. (46) and (65), to obtain Eq. (66).

Let us derive the entanglement flux $\Phi(\mathcal{P})$ of a Pauli channel. One should compute the relative entropy of entanglement of its Choi matrix $\rho_{\mathcal{P}}$, i.e.,

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}) := E_R(\rho_{\mathcal{P}}) := \min_{\sigma \in \text{SEP}} S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}}||\sigma), \tag{67}$$

where, for two qubits, the set of separable states (SEP) coincides with the set of states with positive partial transpose (PPT). The relative entropy at the RHS of Eq. (67) can be computed using the formula

$$\begin{aligned} S(\rho||\sigma) &= -S(\rho) - \text{Tr}\,(\rho \log \sigma) \\ &= -S(\rho) - \sum_i \langle i|\rho|i\rangle \log s_i \ , \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

where $|i\rangle$ (s_i) are the eigenstates (eigenvalues) of σ.

Finding the minimum in Eq. (67) is hard in general. A very good candidate is the following separable state

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\sigma} &:= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u=0,1} |u\rangle\langle u| \otimes \mathcal{P}(|u\rangle\langle u|) \\ &= \frac{p_0+p_3}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|) \\ &+ \frac{p_1+p_2}{2}(|01\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10|), \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

which is diagonal in the computational basis $\{|i\rangle\} = \{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$, with eigenvalues $\{\tilde{s}_i\}$ given by

$$\left\{ \frac{p_0+p_3}{2}, \frac{p_1+p_2}{2}, \frac{p_1+p_2}{2}, \frac{p_0+p_3}{2} \right\}. \tag{70}$$

Thus, we compute the bound

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}) \leq S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}}||\widetilde{\sigma}) = -S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}}) - \sum_i \langle i|\rho_{\mathcal{P}}|i\rangle \log \tilde{s}_i \ , \tag{71}$$

where $S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}})$ is given in Eq. (65). Using Eq. (62), it is easy to check that

$$-\sum_i \langle i|\rho_{\mathcal{P}}|i\rangle \log \tilde{s}_i = 1 + H_2(p_1+p_2) \ ,$$

where $H_2(p) := -p\log_2 p - (1-p)\log_2(1-p)$ is the binary Shannon entropy. Thus, for a Pauli channel with arbitrary distribution $\mathbf{p} = \{p_k\}$, we may write the bound

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}) \leq 1 + H_2(p_1+p_2) - H(\mathbf{p}) \ . \tag{72}$$

This result can be specialized for the dephasing and depolarizing channels.

Dephasing channel

This is a Pauli channel with probability distribution $\mathbf{p} = \{p, 0, 0, 1-p\}$, so that we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{deph}}(\rho) = p\rho + (1-p) Z\rho Z \ . \tag{73}$$

It is easy to see that Eq. (72) leads to

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}_{\text{deph}}) \leq 1 - H_2(p) \ . \tag{74}$$

Note that this upper bound coincides with the lower bound give by the coherent information $I_C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{deph}}) = 1 - H_2(p)$ using Eq. (66). Thus, we get

$$Q_2(\mathcal{P}_{\text{deph}}) = K(\mathcal{P}_{\text{deph}}) = 1 - H_2(p) \ , \tag{75}$$

which coincides with the unassisted quantum capacity of the channel $Q(\mathcal{P}) = 1 - H_2(p)$ [33].

Depolarizing channel

This is a Pauli channel with probability distribution

$$\mathbf{p} = \left\{ 1 - \frac{3p}{4}, \frac{p}{4}, \frac{p}{4}, \frac{p}{4} \right\}, \tag{76}$$

so that we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{depol}}(\rho) = \left(1 - \frac{3p}{4}\right)\rho + \frac{p}{4}(X\rho X + Y\rho Y + Z\rho Z) \ . \tag{77}$$

From Eq. (72) we compute

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}_{\text{depol}}) \leq 1 + H_2\left(\frac{p}{2}\right) - H_2\left(\frac{3p}{4}\right) - \frac{3p}{4}\log_2 3 \ . \tag{78}$$

This has to be compared with the following lower bound [32]

$$Q(\mathcal{P}_{\text{depol}}) \geq 1 - H_2\left(\frac{3p}{4}\right) - \frac{3p}{4}\log_2 3 \ . \tag{79}$$

Also note that the unassisted quantum capacity must satisfy

$$Q(\mathcal{P}_{\text{depol}}) \leq 1 - 3p \quad \text{for } 0 \leq p \leq \frac{1}{3},$$

and $Q(\mathcal{P}_{\text{depol}}) = 0$ otherwise.

We may improve the bound in Eq. (78) by resorting to the same argument of Ref. [31]. Let us denote by $\mathcal{P}^p_{\text{depol}}$ a depolarizing channel with probability p. Then, we may write the convex combination

$$\mathcal{P}^p_{\text{depol}} = (1-\alpha)\mathcal{P}^{\varepsilon}_{\text{depol}} + \alpha \mathcal{P}^{2/3}_{\text{depol}}, \tag{80}$$

where $\alpha = (p-\epsilon)/(2/3-\epsilon)$ and $0 \leq \epsilon \leq p \leq 2/3$. Here $\mathcal{P}^{2/3}_{\text{depol}}$ is entanglement-breaking, so that $\Phi(\mathcal{P}^{2/3}_{\text{depol}}) = 0$. Then, using the convexity of the entanglement flux, we may write $\Phi(\mathcal{P}^p_{\text{depol}}) \leq (1-\alpha)\Phi(\mathcal{P}^{\varepsilon}_{\text{depol}})$. Now, for any p, we may consider an improved upper bound by minimizing over ε, i.e.,

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}^p_{\text{depol}}) \leq \min_{\epsilon} (1-\alpha)\Phi(\mathcal{P}^{\varepsilon}_{\text{depol}}) \ . \tag{81}$$

Entanglement flux of the erasure channel

This is not a Pauli channel. With some probability p, this channel replaces an incoming qubit state ρ with an erasure state $|2\rangle$, which is orthogonal to it. In other words, we have the action

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}(\rho) = (1-p)\rho + p|2\rangle\langle 2| \ . \tag{82}$$

Its Choi matrix is given by

$$\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}} = (1-p)|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| + \frac{p}{2}\left(|02\rangle\langle 02| + |12\rangle\langle 12|\right) \ . \tag{83}$$

We construct the candidate separable state as before, i.e., we pick

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\sigma} &:= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{u=0,1} |u\rangle\langle u| \otimes \mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}(|u\rangle\langle u|) \\ &= \frac{1-p}{2}\left(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|\right) \\ &+ \frac{p}{2}\left(|02\rangle\langle 02| + |12\rangle\langle 12|\right) \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

which is diagonal in the computational basis.

Now by diagonalizing Eq. (83), we compute the entropy

$$S(\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}}) = (1-p)\log(1-p) + p\log\left(\frac{p}{2}\right) \ . \tag{85}$$

Then, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}-\sum_i \langle i|\rho|i\rangle \log \tilde{s}_i = &-\langle 00|\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}}|00\rangle \log\left(\frac{1-p}{2}\right) \\ &-\langle 11|\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}}|11\rangle \log\left(\frac{1-p}{2}\right) \\ -\langle 02|\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}}|02\rangle \log\left(\frac{p}{2}\right) &- \langle 12|\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}}|12\rangle \log\left(\frac{p}{2}\right) \ .\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

Combining Eqs. (85) and (86), we derive the entanglement flux (upper bound) of the erasure channel

$$\Phi(\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}) \leq S(\rho_{\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}}||\widetilde{\sigma}) = 1-p \ . \tag{87}$$

Note that the two-way quantum capacity of the erasure channel is already known to be $Q_2(\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}) = 1-p$ [13]. This means that we have determined the secret-key capacity of this channel, since

$$Q_2(\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}) \leq K(\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}) \leq \Phi(\mathcal{E}_{\text{erase}}) \ . \tag{88}$$

Entanglement flux of the generalized dephasing channel

Consider the dephasing channel for a d dimensional system. This channel has Kraus representation [40, 41]

$$\mathcal{P}_d(\rho) = \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} E_m \rho E_m^{\dagger}, \quad E_m = \sqrt{P_m(p,d)}Z^m, \tag{89}$$

where

$$P_m(p,d) = \binom{d-1}{m} p^m (1-p)^{d-1-m} \ , \tag{90}$$

and Z is defined in Eq. (23).

Let us compute the Choi matrix $\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d} = (I \otimes \mathcal{P}_d)(\Psi_d)$, where $|\Psi_d\rangle = d^{-1/2}\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}|ii\rangle$. We find

$$\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d} = \sum_{m,i,j}^{d-1} \frac{P_m(p,d)}{d} \exp\left[\frac{2i\pi}{d}(i-j)m\right] |ii\rangle\langle jj|.$$

By diagonalizing this density matrix, one finds d nonzero eigenvalues $\mathbf{P} := \{P_0(p,d), \ldots, P_{d-1}(p,d)\}$, so that the Von Neumann entropy of $\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d}$ is easily computed

$$S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d}) = H(\mathbf{P}) = -\sum_m^{d-1} P_m(p,d)\log_2 P_m(p,d). \tag{91}$$

We now introduce the following optimal separable state (diagonal in the computational basis)

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\sigma} &= \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \frac{1}{d}|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \mathcal{P}_d(|i\rangle\langle i|) \\ &= \sum_{i,m=0}^{d-1} \frac{P_m(p,d)}{d}|ii\rangle\langle ii| = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\frac{1}{d}|ii\rangle\langle ii| \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

where we have used $\sum_m P_m(p,d) = 1$. Thus we can derive the second term in the REE

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Tr}(\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d}\log\widetilde{\sigma}) &= \sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\langle ii|\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d}|ii\rangle \log_2\frac{1}{d} \\ &= \sum_m P_m(p,d)\log_2\frac{1}{d} \\ &= -\log_2 d\end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

Combining Eqs. (91) and (93), we derive the following result for the entanglement flux of the generalized dephasing channel

$$\Phi(\mathcal{P}_d) \leq S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d}||\widetilde{\sigma}) = \log_2 d - H(\mathbf{P}), \tag{94}$$

which reduces to Eq. (75) for $d=2$ (qubits). Note that $\Phi(\mathcal{P}_d) \leq \log_2 d - S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d})$ and, according to Eq. (45), the coherent information of this (unital) channel is $I_C(\mathcal{P}_d) = \log_2 d - S(\rho_{\mathcal{P}_d})$. As a result, lower and upper bounds coincide and we determine the two-way assisted capacities

$$Q_2(\mathcal{P}_d) = K(\mathcal{P}_d) = \log_2 d - H(\mathbf{P}). \tag{95}$$

[1] Bennett, C. H. & Brassard, G. Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing. *Proc. IEEE International Conf. on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing*, Bangalore, pp. 175–179 (1984).

[2] Ekert, A. K. Quantum Cryptography based on Bell's Theorem. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661–663 (1991).

[3] Grosshans, F., et al. Quantum key distribution using gaussian-modulated coherent states. *Nature* **421**, 238-241 (2003).

[4] Braunstein, S. L. & Pirandola, S. Side-channel-free quantum key distribution. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 130502 (2012).

[5] Pirandola, S., et al. High-rate measurement-device-independent quantum cryptography. *Nature Photon.* **9**, 397-402 (2015).

[6] Kimble, H. J. The quantum internet. *Nature* **453**, 1023 (2008).

[7] Pirandola, S., et al. Advances in quantum teleportation. *Nature Photon.* **9**, 641-652 (2015).

[8] Andersen, U. L., Neergaard-Nielsen, J. S., van Loock, P. & Furusawa, A. Hybrid discrete- and continuous-variable quantum information. *Nature Phys.* **11**, 713–719 (2015).

[9] Xiang, Z.-L., Ashhab, S., You, J. Q. & Nori, F. Hybrid quantum circuits: Superconducting circuits interacting with other quantum systems. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 623-653 (2013).

[10] Kurizki, G., et al. Quantum technologies with hybrid systems. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, 3866-73 (2015).

[11] Briegel, H.-J., Dür, W., Cirac, J. I. & Zoller, P. Quantum repeaters: The role of imperfect local operations in quantum communication. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5932-5935 (1998).

[12] Pirandola, S., Laurenza, R., Ottaviani, C. & Banchi, L. Ultimate rate of quantum communications. *Preprint arXiv*:1510.08863 (2015).

[13] Bennett, C. H., DiVincenzo, D. P., & Smolin, J. A. Capacities of Quantum Erasure Channels. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 3217-3220 (1997).

[14] Horodecki, K., Horodecki, M., Horodecki, P. & Oppenheim, J. Secure key from bound entanglement. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 160502 (2005).

[15] Note that maximally-entangled states are specific types of private states [14].

[16] Schumacher, B. & Nielsen, M. A. Quantum data processing and error correction. *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2629-2635 (1996).

[17] Lloyd, S. Capacity of the noisy quantum channel. *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 1613 (1997).

[18] García-Patrón, R., Pirandola, S., Lloyd, S. & Shapiro, J. H. Reverse coherent information. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 210501 (2009).

[19] Pirandola, S., García-Patrón, R., Braunstein, S. L. & Lloyd, S. Direct and reverse secret-key capacities of a quantum channel. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 050503 (2009).

[20] Devetak, I. & Winter, A. Relating quantum privacy and quantum coherence: an operational approach. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 080501 (2004).

[21] Vedral, V. The role of relative entropy in quantum information theory. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 197 (2002).

[22] Wilde, M. M. *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013).

[23] In such a channel, we have $|0\rangle\langle 0| \to |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $|1\rangle\langle 1| \to p\,|1\rangle\langle 1| + (1-p)\,|0\rangle\langle 0|$ for some probability p. Clearly, there is no unitary U able to realize $U\mathcal{E}_{\rm damp}(|0\rangle\langle 0|)U^\dagger = \mathcal{E}_{\rm damp}(X\,|0\rangle\langle 0|\,X)$ for Pauli operator X.

[24] Weedbrook, C., et al. Gaussian quantum information. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 621 (2012).

[25] A. Holevo, *Quantum systems, channels, information: A mathematical introduction* (De Gruyter, Berlin-Boston, 2012).

[26] Hosseinidehaj, N. & Malaney, R. Gaussian entanglement distribution via satellite. *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 022304 (2015).

[27] Holevo, A. S. & Werner, R. F. Evaluating capacities of bosonic Gaussian channels. *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 032312 (2001).

[28] Wolf, M. M., Pérez-García, D. & Giedke, G. Quantum Capacities of Bosonic Channels. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 130501 (2007).

[29] Takeoka, M., Guha, S. & Wilde, M.M. Fundamental rate-loss tradeoff for optical quantum key distribution. *Nature Comms.* **5**, 5235 (2014).

[30] Takeoka, M., Guha, S. & Wilde, M. M. The Squashed Entanglement of a Quantum Channel. *IEEE Tran. on Information Theory* **60**, 4987-4998 (2014).

[31] Goodenough, K., Elkouss, D. & Wehner, S. Assessing the performance of quantum repeaters for all phase-insensitive Gaussian bosonic channels. *Preprint arXiv*:1511.08710v1 (2015).

[32] Preskill, J. Lecture notes on Quantum Information theory, www.theory.caltech.edu/people/preskill/ph229/

[33] Devetak, I. & Shor, P. W. The Capacity of a Quantum Channel for Simultaneous Transmission of Classical and Quantum Information. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **256**, 287-303 (2005).

[34] Furthermore, any other non-trace preserving local operation which might be performed by Alice and Bob can be made completely coherent. This is done by replacing measurements with suitable unitaries, ancillary systems and including their outputs in the ensembles **a** and **b**.

[35] It is important to note the basic differences between this procedure and the programmable quantum gate arrays [36]. In our case, we are not considering a universal set of quantum operations applied to an input system but a fixed quantum channel which suitably "commutes" with teleportation. Thus, instead of post-selecting the identity outcome $\mathcal{U}_k = I$ (occurring with probability 2^{-d} for a qudit and zero probability for a CV system), we can consider all the outcomes of the Bell detection which are then fed-forward in the final LOCC. Thus, our method departs from probabilistic (i.e., non trace-preserving) programmable quantum processors and their equivalent of port-based teleportation [37] (requiring infinite uses of the channel). In particular, the fact that our method provides an overall trace-preserving LOCC is absolutely crucial for the simplification of the adaptive protocols.

[36] Nielsen, M. A. & Chuang, I. L. Programmable Quantum Gate Arrays. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 321 (1997).

[37] Ishizaka, S. & Hiroshima, T. Asymptotic Teleportation Scheme as a Universal Programmable Quantum Processor. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 240501 (2008).

[38] Donald, M. J. & Horodecki, M. Continuity of Relative Entropy of Entanglement. *Phys. Lett. A* **264**, 257-260 (1999).

[39] Banchi, L., Braunstein, S. L., & Pirandola, S. Quantum fidelity for arbitrary Gaussian states. *Preprint arXiv*:1507.01941 (2015). In press on PRL.

[40] Fukuda, M. & Holevo, A. S. On Weyl covariant channels, Preprint quant-ph/0510148 (2005).

[41] Pirandola, S., Mancini, S., Braunstein, S. L. & Vitali, D. Minimal qudit code for a qubit in the phase-damping channel. Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032309 (2008).